

**From:** Cynthia Grossen  
**To:** 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'  
**Date:** 1/15/02 11:02am  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

excerpt from Complaint

"5. To protect its valuable Windows monopoly against such potential competitive threats, and to extend its operating system monopoly into other software markets, Microsoft has engaged in a series of anticompetitive activities. Microsoft's conduct includes agreements tying other Microsoft software products to Microsoft's Windows operating system; exclusionary agreements precluding companies from distributing, promoting, buying, or using products of Microsoft's software competitors or potential competitors; and exclusionary agreements restricting the right of companies to provide services or resources to Microsoft's software competitors or potential competitors."

My biggest problem with "the way things are now" is that as it stands, I can not buy a computer from a large computer seller, like DELL, MICRON, BestBuy, Circuit City, etc without being forced to purchase the bundled M\$ software; even if I have no interest in every utilizing said software.

Also, it is my understanding that most of these venders are prohibited from offering "dual-boot" systems as well, as part of their OEM license agreement with M\$. Which would be a 'second-best' solution to the above problem, from my standpoint at least. I do realize that their are legitimate market concerns as well, such as poor customer demand. But I find it difficult to believe that the fact that M\$ owns the OS market (read monopoly here) doesn't play into my concerns in a significant way.

I feel that this area is one of crucial importance to future remedies. The browser arguments are extremely compelling and should definitely play into the settlement. But the "Browser War" is effectively over. M\$ won.